REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 4, 8, 11-13 and 15 are amended and claims 10 and 16-17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action objects to the disclosure because of informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendment to the specification obviates the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 5,600,279 to Mori. The Office Action also rejects claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 5,367,269 to Yanagidaira et al. (hereafter Yanagidaira). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 5,355,098 to Iwasaki. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a memory to store control voltages and a processor to load a control voltage, which corresponds to a changed channel, from the memory when a system channel is changed, and to provide the control voltage to a Voltage Control Oscillator (VCO).

The applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. The applied references do not relate to providing a control voltage corresponding to each channel when a channel is changed. More specifically, the applied references do not teach or suggest to load a control voltage, which corresponds to a changed channel, from the memory (that stores control voltages) when a system channel is changed.

Iwasaki discloses a phase-lock-loop in which an object is to shorten a locking-up time of the loop when it is controlled ON or OFF even though a supply voltage and/or an ambient air temperature changes. See col. 2, lines-6-9. Iwasaki merely discloses the voltage supplied to the VCO 3 may be changed. See col. 5, line 33-col. 6, line 17. Iwasaki does not teach or suggest a memory storing control voltages in combination with a processor to load a control voltage, which corresponds to changed channel, from the memory when a system channel is changed, as recited in independent claim 1.

Additionally, Yanagidaira discloses generation of a jamming signal using a CPU 1 and a memory 5. Yanagidaira produces a jamming signal having a frequency based on data. See col. 1, line 33-col. 2, line 20; and Figure 14. However, Yanagidaira does not teach or suggest a memory storing control voltages in combination with a processor to load a control voltage, which corresponds to a changed channel, from the memory when a system channel has changed, as recited in independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Mori discloses a memory 19 to store digital values of an adjustment voltage VD2 with which a control voltage VD1 and the oscillation frequency F0 of the VCO circuit 11 have a predetermined relationship. The adjusting circuit may include a CPU 18, memory 19 and D-to-A converter 20. See col. 5, line 52-col. 6, line 47. However, Mori does not teach or suggest a memory storing control voltages in combination with a processor to load a control voltage, which corresponds to a changed channel, from the memory when a system channel has changed, as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Each of independent claims 8 and 15 define patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 8 recites storing control voltages in a memory and loading the control voltage, which corresponds to a changed channel, from the memory to a VCO when a system channel is changed. Additionally, independent claim 15 recites a memory device to store control voltages and a processor to load the control voltage, which corresponds to a changed channel, from the memory device to the VCO when a system channel is changed. For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these respective features of independent claims 8 and 15. Thus, these claims define patentable subject matter.

Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-20 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DCO/kah
Date: October 5, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610